Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HEBRAICA.

VOL. VIII. OCTOBER, 1891—JANUARY, 1892. NOS. 1 AND 2.

THE ORDER OF THE SENTENCE IN THE ASSYRIAN HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS.

BY LESTER BRADNER, JR., PH. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

A. The object of the investigation.

The following discussion is among the first attempts at building up, on the basis of careful and extended observation, not only an accurate and scientific but a historical syntax of the Assyrian language. So little progress has hitherto been made in this department, that the work, if properly carried out, need be done but once in order to establish both the syntax itself, and historical development.

The present investigation has been confined to a small department of the syntactical field. The aim has been (1) to determine accurately the usual order of the sentence, and to trace any development of it that should arise during the growth of the language; (2) to account as far as possible for any changes from the usual order thus determined; and (3) to show the relative frequency of such variations at different periods.

B. The progress already made.

Probably the best formulated statement of the results already obtained in this line is to be found in various paragraphs of Delitzsch's *Assyrian Grammar*, although these are meagre, ill-arranged, and not intended to be historical. His deductions are in the main as follows:

The Object precedes its Verb, § 142; the Adjective follows its Noun, § 121; (Numerals follow rules for Adjective, §129). Appositional words or phrases follow the substantive to which they belong, § 125. (In any of the above cases the opposite arrangement indicates emphasis.) Infinitives used as Constructs precede

their Objects but as finite forms they follow, § 132. Participles precede their Objects or Adverbial Modifiers, except in rare cases, § 131. Attributive Relative clauses may occasionally precede their Antecedent, § 147. Other brief details are noted on pages 350, 358.

Whether or not these statements are to be added to, or modified, will be better, judged at the close of the present discussion.

C. The method of investigation.

In a complete discussion, not only the order of Subject, Object, and Predicate, should be considered but also that of their Modifiers, as well as Numerals, Infinitives, Participles, and Relative clauses; but as a number of these topics are being examined by other investigators at the present time, I have confined my discussion to the first three.

In order to obtain complete results it has been necessary to separate compound sentences into their component clauses, and to regard these as complete sentences, although they may be closely connected with some preceding clause, and therefore even lack perhaps a separate Subject or Object. Many cases also where the Assyrian is enabled by a verb with a pronominal suffix to condense a sentence into a single word, it has been necessary from the nature of the case to leave out of consideration. The order of each sentence, as regards the position of Subject, Object, and Predicate has thus been examined, and the results tabulated under the main heads of Declarative, or Principal, and Relative, or Subordinate sentences. Having ascertained that a certain order everywhere prevailed more or less extensively, this has been adopted as the Normal Order, and an attempt made to explain the causes of variation from it.

This method has been carried through the range of historical inscriptions, from Tiglath-Pileser I. to Ašurbanipal, covering some 500 years,* and a careful

---

* The material examined begins with several short inscriptions previous to Tiglath-Pileser I. namely:

1. Pudi-ilu (about 1350 B. C.), *ZA.* II. 3, p. 313.
2. Ramman-nirari I. (about 1325 B. C.), IV R. 44, 45.
3. Tuklat-Adar I. (about 1275 B. C.), III R. 4, No. 2.
4. Ašûr-rîš-iši (about 1150 B. C.), III R. 3, No. 6.

Then follow in order,

5. Tiglath-Pileser I. (about 1100 B. C.), I R. 9-16.
6. Ašurnaṣirpal (885-860) Annals, I R. 17-26; I R. 27, No. 2; I R. 28.
7. Shalmaneser II. (860-825) Obelisk, Lay. 87-98. Monolith, III R. 7-8.
8. Šamši-Ramman (825-812) I R. 29-31, 32-34.
9. Ramman-nirari III. (812-783) I R. 35, Nos. 3, 1, 2.
10. Tiglath-Pileser III. (745-727) Lay. 17-18; II R. 67.
11. Sargon (722-705) Annals, Winckler, *Keilschriftexte Sargon.;* Khorsabad Annals, Room XIV.; "Pavé des Ports," *ibid.;* Cylinder I R. 35; Bull Inscriptions, Lyon, *Sargontexte;* Stele Inscription, Winckler, *Keil. Sarg.;* Nimrud Inscription, Lay. 33-34; Bronze, Silver Inscriptions, Lyon, *Sarg.;* "Revers des Plaques," Winckler, *Keil. Sarg.;* Harem Inscription, *ibid.;* Gold, Antimony Inscriptions, Lyon, *Sarg.*
12. Sennacherib (705-681) Taylor Cyl., I R. 37-42.
13. Esarhaddon (681-660) Cyl. A, I R. 45-47; Cyl. B, Robert Francis Harper *AEl.;* Black Stone I R. 49-50.
14. Ašurbanipal (668-626) Rassam Cyl., V R. 1-10.

comparison made of the tabulated results, with the purpose of exhibiting whatever development may have taken place in the usage of the language in this respect. An endeavor has been made to perform the work carefully, and although one is always liable to error, it is believed that the tables will be found sufficiently accurate for purposes of comparison and general calculation.

II. THE HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION.

A. Tiglath-Pileser I.*

The following table presents in brief the results of the examination of this inscription.

TABLE I.†

TIG.-PIL. I. (ABOUT 1100).

Number of Declarative sentences	322
" " Relative "	86
Total	408

Cases of Nominal Order.	Declarative.	Relative.	Total.
Subject, Object, Predicate	16	18	34
Object, Object, Predicate	6	3	9
Object, Subject, Predicate	..	9	9
Subject, Predicate	36	54	90
Object, Predicate	264	47	311

Cases of Inverted Order.	Declarative.	Relative.	Total.
Object, Subject, Predicate	4	..	4
Predicate, Object	1	2	3

* The investigation has been begun with Tiglath-Pileser I., as offering the most extended basis for deduction among the older inscriptions. A comparison has then been instituted between this and earlier fragments, after which the other inscriptions have been examined in their historical order.

† In explanation of the table several remarks may be made, which will apply also to later tables.

(a) The head Declarative has been made to include also Cohortative, Imperative, etc., all which would probably come under the head of principal sentences. A separate table of such will be given later.

(b) The order Object, Subject, Predicate, would not be an inverted order in an Attributive Relative sentence, owing to the fact that the Relative Pronoun, whether Subject or Object, must stand at the head of the sentence. In a Declarative sentence, on the other hand, this order would be inverted, and has been so noted in the tables.

(c) The orders Subject, Predicate; Object, Predicate; and Predicate, Subject, or Object are in the table made to include cases where the third member of the complete sentence is also present, as well as sentences where only the two members noted are found. So that to find the actual number of the latter, we must subtract the number of complete sentences found above in any particular case, viz., the actual number of sentences of the order Object, Predicate, and containing only two members, in Tiglath-Pileser is 264 minus 14 and 6, the number of complete sentences found where the Object also comes before the Predicate.

(d) The sentences tabulated are all verbal unless otherwise noted. For a discussion of the nominal sentence, see a later note.

The above table proves conclusively that by the usual order, during the early period at least, the Predicate closes the sentence, and that the normal arrangement of the parts is Subject, Object, Predicate, if all of them are fully expressed. Inasmuch as the examination of the other inscriptions has shown that this rule will hold good through all, I have called any departure from this order an Inverted Sentence. A farther study of the table shows that the Relative sentences follow the same general rule as Declarative, and again, that where a verb governs two objects, as is quite frequent, they both ordinarily precede the verb. The unusually large predominance of the order Object, Predicate, is found in all the historical material, and is mostly due to its narrative style, where the subject is rarely expressed unless emphatic.

As against 401 cases of normal order, therefore, we find only seven cases of inversion, giving a ratio of .017 together, or separately Declarative, .018; Relative, .023.

Examining in detail these seven cases, in order to account if possible for so unusual a phenomenon at this period, we may divide them into four groups. (1) In three cases (II 25–28; V 8–10; VI 39–45) we find the order Object, Subject, Predicate, where normally the Subject should stand first. They all contain the phrase ḳâti ikšud, where ḳâti is the Subject, and it is probable that the phrase has so far become a stereotyped expression (equivalent practically to anâku akšud or simply akšud) that kâti having merely a pronominal force is placed near the verb, at least we shall find such to be its usage in the subsequent inscriptions. (2) Two other cases may be classed together (I 45 ušamḳitu gir Ašûr; VII 41, ušamḳitu ḳališ multarḫi). These are Relative sentences of the form Predicate, Object, where we should have normally the reverse order. In explanation of the inversion the following points are to be noted. (a) That these examples form the *third clause* in a Relative sentence, where we ordinarily find ša repeated;* (b) that the order is chiastic with the preceding clause, a favorite variation in the later inscriptions, and (c) that they stand at the end of a paragraph. We may perhaps consider that the chiastic order results from an effort to bring these clauses into closer connection with the preceding. (3) In VI 49 we find ezib ḫarranât nakri mâdâtu. This Declarative clause (order, Predicate, Object) with those closely following introduces a break in the narrative, and the prowess of the monarch as a conqueror is summed up briefly before the scribe passes on to narrate his successes in hunting and building. Hence we are justified in regarding this inversion as due to emphasis, by way of contrast with the preceding narrative.† (4) The rea-

* It is a principle enunciated by Kraetzschmar, and which holds good throughout the historical inscriptions, that Relative clauses, when more than one follow the same antecedent, generally occur in pairs, with one ša sufficing for each pair, but repeated with the odd clause.

† An interesting parallel in almost the same words is found in the so-called Hunting Inscription of Ašurnaṣirpal (I 34 sq.) which belongs perhaps more properly to Tiglath-Pileser, a view with which the parallel accords.

son for the inverted order in II 23 sq. Šalmât ḳurâdišunu (nâru) dame ana Diglat ušêṣi is not plain, unless the writer desired to bring into conjunction the names of the two rivers. That a change of order should be made for a logical or rhetorical convenience of this sort seems quite as likely as the vowel changes that are often made for the sake of euphony. But an interchange of place between Subject and Object is not of so much importance as between either of these and the Predicate.*

We have therefore suggested certain principles governing inversion, such as chiastic order, use of ḳâtu near the Verb, desire for close connection or euphonic structure, occurrence at the end of a paragraph, and emphasis, all of which will be found holding good in later inscriptions. In this respect the rule laid down by Delitzsch (§ 142) that the Object may be placed either before or after the Verb, according as greater emphasis is to be laid on the Object or on the Verb, is not adequate to cover the majority of cases. In fact I am able to show that the desire for emphasis will account for only a very few cases of inversion, as compared with the whole number.

I have also made some examination to determine whether an inverted order gives evidence of any subordination of the inverted clause, as in the case of Circumstantial Clauses in Hebrew and Arabic, but have reached the conclusion that such object was not distinctly sought. In only a few cases would a similar idea of subordination be found fitting to the idea expressed by the clause. And one cannot fail to note that the spirit of Assyrian cares little for subordinate ideas. Coördination is the rule, to an extent which grows rather tiresome to modern ears.

B. Before Tiglath-Pileser.

Returning now to examine the material offered us by inscriptions earlier than Tiglath-Pileser, we find it very meagre, the only ones important for our purposes being those of Ramman-nirari I., Pudi-ilu, Tuklat-Adar I., and Ašur-rîš-išî, and these contain but four complete sentences. These inscriptions cover some 250 years before Tiglath-Pileser I. and as 215 years more elapse before the next inscription of any size occurs, it is to be regretted that we have not more early material to compare with Tiglath-Pileser, but the little we have accords well with the results already obtained. The following is the tabular statement of these four earlier records.

---

* There are two cases in which it might appear that inversion had taken place, but which may be better explained otherwise. One is II 43 sq. Narkabâtiya....alḳi Diglat. A comparison with III 97–99 will show that ebir is to be supplied after Diglat. The other case is III. 41 sq., where the words šadâni šaḳûti might be construed (as Lotz seems to have taken them) as the object of lu aṣbat, but it is better to regard them as Accusative of place with the following principal clause: "*In high mountains which*....narkabâti ina lâ bani lu emid." With lu aṣbat there is then to be supplied as object the word ḫarranu as also in V 45 sq., 68 sq.

TABLE II.

FRAGMENTS BEFORE TIG.-PIL.

Number of Declarative sentences	25
" " Relative "	21
Total	46

Cases of Normal Order.	Declarative.	Relative.	Total.
Subject, Object, Predicate	6	4	10
Subject, Predicate	7	13	20
Object, Predicate	19	12	31

Cases of Inverted Order.	Declarative.	Relative.	Total.
Object, Subject, Predicate	..	2	2
Subject, Object, Predicate	..	1	1

This table presents in the main the same features as that of Tiglath-Pileser I. We note the same predominance of the general order, Subject, Object, Predicate. The only exceptions to this normal order are found in Relative clauses, only one of which however affects the position of the verb. The small amount of material would scarcely yield a fair comparison on the basis of a percentage, but we may examine the cases of inversion in detail. The earliest are those in Ramman-nirari I. (a) Obv. 10–12: ša napḫar malki u rubûti Anu Ašûr Šamaš Ramman u Ištar ana šepišu ušêknišu.

Here the inversion consists in placing the Object before the Subject. It is probable in order to emphasize the Object, and it also brings napḫar....rubûti into closer relation with a similar idea of totality expressed in the preceding clauses. (b) Obv. 25sq.: u nagab za'erišu ḳâsu ikšudu. This is the same use of ḳâtu near the verb of which we have already found two cases in Tiglath-Pileser. The third instance of inversion is in Asûr-rîš-išî l. 3sq.: u.....ili ša šame u irṣiti (ira)muma iḳriba šangûtsu. The order is Subject, Predicate, Object, and it is again the third clause in a Relative sentence, although not chiastically arranged, as in the similar cases in Tiglath-Pileser. But no particular emphasis seems to be intended, and therefore I think it best to consider it merely an artistic device for rounding up with effect a short period, instead of repeating the relative particle with a single clause.

The style and usage then in these earlier inscriptions seems to correspond to that of Tiglath-Pileser, and we may consider them all, for our purposes, as a unit, in spite of the fact that they cover some two hundred years or more.

C. Ašurnaṣirpal.

During more than two centuries from the time of Tiglath-Pileser we have no records which will allow us to examine the syntactical growth of the language. Then we meet with the long annals of Ašurnaṣirpal, who reigned from 885 to

860 B. C. Here we find less of the rigidity which is so marked in Tiglath-Pileser. The sentences are longer, there is more freedom in the use of Relative clauses, especially the temporal, but even yet the style is stereotyped, and in places exceedingly repetitious. It lacks the narrative interest of Sargon or Sennacherib, and the varied diction of Ašurbanipal. It still belongs, as far as we may judge from the historical inscriptions, to the primary period of the literature. The inscription has marked peculiarities in many respects, and especially in orthography, but in the structure of the sentence, it does not depart so widely from the older standards, as the table* will show. Several points in it are worthy of note. (a) The great preponderance of Declarative sentences (greater than in Tiglath-Pileser), and among these of the order Object, Predicate. This is, of course, due to the narrative style, so that in the introduction before the narrative begins, the number of Relative clauses is much greater in proportion, and at the same time inversions are more frequent. (This is always true in the introductory descriptions of the kings). (b) The number of cases of inversion is as yet small in comparison with the total of sentences. The figures given in the table, taken as they stand yield the following results:

Ratio of inversions in Declarative sentences.....	.041
" " " " Relative "	.16
" " " " Total "	.055

(with these compare the corresponding results in Tiglath-Pileser: Declarative, .015; Relative, .023; total, .017).

But in fact among the cases in Declarative sentences, twenty consist of the same phrase asakan mittaḳ, five of the phrase akuṣu mašakšu, and three of the phrase utera mittaḳ. Therefore in a more just estimate we should take the number of inversions in Declarative clauses at five, which would reduce the ratio in these to .006 and on the total to .027. (c) It is also noticeable that by far the larger ratio of inversions is found in Relative clauses, and of these 13 out of 19 are met in the first fifty lines of the inscription. This is probably due to the more poetic coloring and style of the introductory portion, but it seems true that inversions take place more easily in a Relative clause than in any other. (d) By the term adverbial inversions, used in reference to this and the following inscriptions is meant the inverted order produced when any word or words not forming one of the three principal parts of the sentence is found after the Predicate. These are most frequently some adverbial expression, or the indirect object of the verb, or appositional phrase.

In accounting for each of the fifty cases of inversion occurring in this inscrip-

* For the tables of this and the following inscriptions see the general table at the end of the historical survey

tion, I have grouped the various usages under several different heads. Sometimes the division may seem to rest on externals, and be unscientific, but with such a delicate subject as style, we can hardly expect to bring every instance of variation under a definite principle.

(a) Cases of inversion of Subject and Object only, not involving the verb. Of these there are seven (I 8sq., II 39, I 24sq., I 39, I 10, III 117, III 122) of which two will serve as examples; II 39 ša ašaršunu mamma lâ êmuru; III 117 mâtâti kališina ḳâtu iksud. These are all Relative sentences, and with them should be contrasted the 23 cases of the normal order: Subject, Object, Predicate. There is no reason to explain any of the above cases by emphasis, but other explanations may be suggested for several. In three cases the principle observed above in regard to the use of ḳâtu appears to hold, and possibly the indefinite mamma seeks the same position. But the more likely explanation of the first four cases (see first example) is that the anticipatory ša attracts towards itself the word whose relative nature it denotes, hence causing the inversion. (b) Passing now to cases where the verb also suffers inversion, we have illustrations of the principle of chiastic order in I 12, tušaršidu palâšu; I 30, ipilu gimra; I 31, ukinnu išreti; I 51, iḫpi kinnašunu.

The first three are Relative clauses, chiastic with the preceding sentence; the last is a Declarative clause chiastic perhaps with the following sentence (i. e., a chiasm of nouns, rather than of verbs as usual). In these cases the artistic arrangement seems to be the only principle inducing the inversion; there is no special emphasis discoverable.

(c) We may, I think, allow this chiastic principle to account for the inversion of clauses which I have termed "indirectly chiastic," that is, where the inverted order occurs in the second clause, but without the verb standing at its head, (in direct conjunction with the verb of the preceding clause). Examples would be, I 29, ina gašiši uritu pagri girišu; I 39, napḫar malki lâ magirišu iksuda rabitu kâtsu.

Both these clauses are second members of a Relative sentence. In the first there is certainly no emphasis to be looked for as causing the inversion, and probably not in the second, although the inverted adjective rabitu might lead one to emphasize also its noun. But just as we found in the earlier inscriptions a similar inversion of the third member, so here the usage is applied to the second and grows more frequent as we proceed in the historical inscriptions.

(d) Our attention is now called to a phenomenon in the realm of inversion which illustrates that stereotyped and crystalline nature of the language so often seen in other connections, namely the unvarying use of a certain expression in the inverted order wherever it occurs. The most noticeable phrase in this inscription is ina....asakan mittaḳ. It occurs no less than 20 times in various similar

connections.* I have been unable to find any reason for the constant inversion of this phrase, but the usage is very striking. The same word mittaḳ is also found inverted in a phrase used three times in Col. II., ana, or, ina ušmaniyama utera mittaḳ, the reason being no more apparent in this case than before. Another invariably inverted phrase is akuṣ mašakšu or akuṣ mašakšunu, which occurs five times in the first column (I 67sq., 89sq., 91sq., 93, 110). In this case we note that the same phrase dûra uḫallib follows each time. Some explanation may perhaps be found therefore in the fact that uḫallib may be construed with two objects and so the position of mašakšu is changed in order to bring the two objects together. Still another example under this head is found in III. 57, ana Gargameš aṣabat urḫu. urḫu like ḫarranu is often found inverted in this expression.

(e) The remaining eight instances of inversion in this inscription (I 1, 4, 5, 7, 40; II 26; III 26 (two)) are all Relative clauses. The first five occur in passages descriptive of the sovereign, and the inversion seems to give a kind of exalted, poetic coloring. As such a usage is marked enough to be readily distinguished I shall call it "ascriptive." It indicates a development from the rigid style of Tiglath-Pileser. The last two are quoted from an inscription on a monument that the king set up, and suggest that the inverted order is chosen where formality and a lofty style are desired. But an entirely satisfactory explanation of these eight cases is lacking.

On the whole, then, in point of frequency of inversion, the development since Tiglath-Pileser is not very great, considering the length of the inscription, and yet more marked in Relative sentence than in Declarative, because confined largely to a small section of the inscription. The new tendencies noted are in the case of stereotyped phrases, indirect chiasm in the second clause, ascriptive clauses in a lofty or formal style, and Relative clauses where ša is anticipatory.†

D. Shalmaneser II.

The date of the annals of Shalmaneser is some thirty years later than the Ašurnaṣirpal inscription, but they show no advance in style, rather do they retrograde to the rigidity of Tiglath-Pileser. Theirs is the true annalistic style, exceedingly dry and repetitious. This is evidenced by the table.‡ There is therefore little to be noted concerning the order of the sentence. There is only one inversion, and this adverbial (l. 21 išpunu abubaniš. Cf. Mon. I 12). It is the second clause in a Relative sentence, and at the end of a paragraph, besides being chiastic in arrangement. This being the sole exception to the normal order out of 260 sentences, the ratios of inversion are much reduced: Declarative, .000; Relative, .085; total, .004.

* II 88, 91sq., 93, 94, 97sq.; III 2, 3, 3sq., 5, 6 (twice), 8, 9, 10sq., 12, 14, 14sq., 15sq., 72, 79; and to these we ought to add three cases where it is evidently understood, III 80, 81, 102.

† The analysis of I R. 27, No. 2, and 28, not being important, is omitted.

‡ See general table, later on.

The Monolith Inscription of Shalmaneser presents us with a more varied style, and resembles in general structure, composition, and vocabulary the annals of Ašurnaṣirpal. Although there are not many inversions (the ratio being Declarative, .026; Relative, .10; total, .032) yet the cases that occur are interesting as shedding a clearer light upon principles already stated. The higher ratio among Relative sentences is still maintained, but we have also a greater variety of usages in the Declarative sentence, which indicate a growth in the flexibility of the language. The principle of chiasm in the second clause becomes more prominent and is illustrated by three examples in Relative and two in Declarative sentences (I 9, 10, 12, 43sq.; II 98). One case of inversion owing to the use of ḳâtu occurs (II 42). The remaining cases can be best brought out in their connection.

I 49. ina ûmešuma adlul narbût ilâni rabûti ša Ašûr u Šamaš ḳurdišunu ušapa ana ṣati, why the inverted order Object, Predicate, should have been used in the first clause is not clear; possibly it served to emphasize the object, or perhaps merely to preserve the symmetry of arrangement which will be noted in a moment. The adverbial inversion in the second clause however may come under the head of indirect chiasm. But looking more closely at the structure we can discover a beautiful balance of parts between the two clauses in chiastic order, which seems hardly a matter of chance. In the first we have Adverb, Verb, Object, Genitive. In the second just the reverse: Genitive, Object, Verb, Adverb. Because of this arrangement it is better to take ša Ašûr u Šamaš with the following clause, than as an appositive of ilâni rabûti, as might possibly be done.

In II 98sq. we have three cases of inversion in succession. The first has been cited under the head of chiasm, the other two are

pân name ušamli rapsâte ummanâtišunu
ina kakki ušardi damišunu.

of which the inversion in the first is to be assigned to emphasis. Then the second clause is again inverted in indirect chiasm. The whole passage is intended to be vivid and striking and for this purpose inversions are used.

But how are we to account for the difference, certainly noticeable, between the two contemporaneous inscriptions in the frequency of inverted orders? One seems to uphold the advance made in the Ašurnaṣirpal inscription, while the other clings to the stiff style of Tiglath-Pileser. Certainly the fact that they were discovered in different places and therefore may have had different authorship must be allowed some weight, and also different subject-matter requires different treatment. The Monolith enters into details where the Annals simply record the fact, and therefore greater variety is required in the former. We must regard it as evidence that too close rules cannot be laid down for the style of any one period, but that results should be dealt with in the large, as illustrating tendencies and general principles rather than definite rules.

E. Šamši-Ramman.

There follows after an interval of only a dozen years the inscription of Šamši-Ramman IV., and yet in respect to the order of the sentence there is a marked change in style, shown by the greatly disproportionate number of inversions in Relative sentences as compared with Declarative. This will appear from a glance at the table. All but one of the cases of inversion occur in the first column. The ratios of Declarative, .01; Relative, .63; total, .105. This shows a very large increase over any previous inscription in the ratio of Relative inversions, and brings the total ratio to twice its former figure at any time. It is plain, on the other hand, that the inverted order has not as yet found its way to any extent into Declarative sentences. The only instance in this inscription where I have not been able to discover a reason for the inversion is IV 2 sq.: ina birit Zaddi Zaban attabalkat nadbak šade. Among the Relative inversions there are three cases of the chiastic order (I 33, 41 sq., 43), and two of the indirect chiastic (I 44; II 48 sq.). Another case of inversion, I 39 sq. enuma Ašurdaninpal.. epuša limnêti, calls attention to the artistic structure of the Relative sentence which it introduces. It consists of four pairs of clauses, with a contrasted order in each pair, thus: enuma Ašûr....epuša limnêti (inverted); siḫumaštu... ušabšima (normal); mâtu ušbalkitma (normal); ikṣura taḫâzu (inverted); nišî Aššur....ittišu ušiškinma (normal); udannina tametu (inverted); mahâzâni ušamgirma (normal); ana epiš ḳabli....iškuna pânišu (inverted). This example illustrates the parallel structure of Relative clauses already referred to, and the usage is found with increasing regularity in the later inscriptions.* It is not clear what reason is to be given for the inversion of the first of the above clauses, whether it is due to the artistic order simply, or to a desire to emphasize limnêti. The remaining cases of inversion are to be found in I 6 sq., 19 sq., 21 (adverbial, chiastic arrangement of nouns); I 11 sq., 29 sq., 32 sq. These are all found in the introductory part of the inscription, and may be classed under the head of ascriptive inversions.

F. Ramman-nirari III.

When in thirty years more we come to the inscriptions of Ramman-nirari III., and attempt their analysis, it is evident from the character of the material that we cannot expect the results to correspond very closely with those already obtained, for the inscriptions are all very short; they contain but a small proportion of narrative, and are mostly couched in that higher style which we have found so prolific in inverted orders. The several short inscriptions have all been grouped together in the classification presented in the table. The figures yield the following ratios for inverted orders: Declarative, .085; Relative, 1.25; total,

* It is on account of this parallelism that I prefer, with Sheil, to connect tametu with udannina, rather than make it a construct with the following mahâzâni.

GENERAL TABLE.

Declarative and Relative Sentences.	Before Tiglath-Pileser. Pudi-ilu, 1350. Ramman-nirari I., 1325. Tuklat-Adar I., 1275. Ašur-rišiši, 1150.		Tiglath-Pileser I. (1100)		Ašurnaṣirpal (885–860) Annals.		Ašurnaṣirpal Monolith.		Ašurnaṣirpal Hunting Inscript.		Shalmaneser II. (860–825) Annals.		Shalmaneser II. Monolith.		Šamši-Ramman (825–812).		Ramman-nirari III. (812–783).	
Number of Declarative Sentences.....	25		322		760		49		45		258		316		105		13	
" " Relative Sentences.....	21		86		119		24		12		12		32		31		19	
Total.....	46		408		879		73		57		270		348		136		32	
Cases of Normal Order.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.	Declr.	Rel.
Subject, Object, Predicate.....	6	4	16	18	8	23	5	2	1	1	3	1	11	4	..	3	..	1
Object, Subject, Object, Predicate.....	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..
Object, Object, Predicate.....	..	..	6	3	10	..	1	..	2	..	1	..	8	..	4	..	..	..
Object, Subject, Predicate.....	..	..	..	9	..	4	..	1	..	4	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	2
Subject, Predicate.....	7	13	36	54	64	73	8	4	5	10	14	4	21	18	6	11	3	8
Object, Predicate.....	19	12	264	47	496	56	35	14	34	1	159	1	190	13	80	8	7	3

Cases of Inverted Order.																		
Object, Subject, Predicate	..	2	4	..	..	7	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..
Subject, Predicate, Object	..	1	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	..	1
Object, Subject, Predicate, Object	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Object, Predicate, Object	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
Object, Predicate, Subject	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predicate, Object, Subject	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predicate, Subject, Object	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predicate, Subject	..	..	..	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	2
Predicate, Object	..	..	1	2	29	7	..	..	1	..	..	..	4	2	1	8	1	5
Adverbial Inversions	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	..	1	..	3
Nominal Sentences.																		
Subject, Predicate	..	1	..	3	7	6	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Predicate, Subject	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

.555. While there is but one inversion in the Declarative sentences, in the Relative the inverted order actually predominates. But this is due to the peculiar character of the material, and therefore cannot rightly form a factor in a true estimate of the development, unless we compare it merely with the introductory portions of the previous inscriptions. With these it is quite in harmony but exhibits an increasing tendency toward inversions. The various instances of inverted order may be grouped as follows: (a) Examples of pure chiastic order, (No. 3.* l. 8 sq., 13, 18; No. 1. l. 3); (b) examples of indirect chiasm, three (No. 3. l. 3 sq.; No. 1. 1 sq., 4 sq.); (c) examples of ascriptive inverson, four (No. 3. l. 26 sq.; No. 2. l. 5, 6 (two cases)). The same pairing of Relative clauses with the second inverted, as remarked in Šamši-Ramman is noticeable here also. In other respects there is nothing of importance to be noted.†

* The numbers correspond to those in I R. 35.

† This closes the historical survey of the literature of the Old Assyrian kingdom. The New Assyrian, and the results obtained from the whole will be treated in a following paper.